

### Remarks

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Gibbons et al. (US Patent No. 5,305,020) and Parsons et al. (US Patent No. 5,133,048).

The office action states that Gibbons provides information about the visual characteristics of the paper, such as the 'type/size information, and the status of the tray 126, such as full/empty information...' However, as specifically set out in the specification of the instant application on page 4, lines 1-5, the visual characteristics of the papers are different from the physical characteristics of the paper such as its size or orientation. Therefore, Gibbons does not provide information about the visual characteristics of the paper. Also, as stated in the office action, Gibbons does not teach the step of updating the information about the paper and the tray to a user interface. In addition, as stated above, Gibbons does not providing information about the visual characteristics of the paper.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly state that the information provided is about the characteristics of the surface of the paper, as supported in the specification on page 4, lines 1-5.

Parsons does not teach providing information about the characteristics of the surface of the paper. Parsons allows a user to select information about the physical, as opposed to visual characteristics of the paper, from a menu. That selection may include an indicator of a color selected from a pre-determined menu of colors, not the actual color of the surface of the paper.

Therefore, neither reference, nor the combination thereof, teaches the invention as claimed in claim 1. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 2-3 and 5-6 depend from claim 1 and inherently include all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 2-3 and 5-6 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 12 has been amended to include the similar limitation as in claim 1. It is therefore submitted that claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art for the reasons as applied to claim 1 and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claim 14 depends from claim 12 and inherently includes all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claim. It is therefore submitted that claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 4 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbons and Parsons as applied to claim 1 and further in combination with Sanchez et al. (US Patent No. 5,784,177).

As discussed above, the combination of Gibbons and Parsons does not teach the invention as claimed in claim 1, from which these claims depend. The addition of Sanchez does not overcome this deficiency, not being directed to any of the limitations of claim 1. It is therefore submitted that claims 4 and 7 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbons and Parsons as applied to claim 12 and in combination with Katahira (US Patent No. 6,628,418).

As discussed above, the combination of Gibbons and Parsons does not teach the invention as claimed in claim 12, from which this claim depends. The addition of Katahira

does not overcome this deficiency, not being directed to any of the limitations of claim 12. It is therefore submitted that claim 13 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Parsons et al. As discussed above with regard to claim 8, Parsons is directed to a user interface that allows user to select pre-designated colors, not characteristics of the surface of the paper. While claim 10 further claims that the characteristic of the paper is a color, it is the actual color of the surface of the paper, not a pre-designated color. Claim 8 has been amended to more clearly indicate this difference. It is therefore submitted that claim 8 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 9-11 depend from claim 8 and inherently include all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 9-11 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

*Julie L. Reed*

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

Customer No. 46404  
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM  
1030 SW Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205  
(503) 222-3613